1	STATE OF RHODE ISLAND AND PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS
2	RHODE ISLAND COLLEGE
3	PROJECT LABOR AGREEMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE HEARING
4	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
5	IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING
6	RENOVATIONS AND MODERNIZATION OF GAIGE HALL and CRAIG-LEE HALL; and
7	RENOVATION and ADDITION to FOGARTY LIFE SCIENCES BUILDING
8	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
9	Date: June 19, 2014
LO	Time: 11:30 a.m. Place: Rhode Island College
L1	Gaige Hall Auditorium 600 Mount Pleasant Avenue
L2	North Providence, Rhode Island
L3	
L3 L4	MEMBERS PRESENT:
	MEMBERS PRESENT:  Chairman, Francis T. O'Brien, Associate Professor, PC Kevin Fitta, Director of Capital Projects, RIC
L 4	Chairman, Francis T. O'Brien, Associate Professor, PC
L4 L5	Chairman, Francis T. O'Brien, Associate Professor, PC Kevin Fitta, Director of Capital Projects, RIC Earl Simson, Dean of College of Arts and Sciences, RIC Thomas Bovis, RI Dept. of Administration, Division of Purchases
L4 L5 L6	Chairman, Francis T. O'Brien, Associate Professor, PC Kevin Fitta, Director of Capital Projects, RIC Earl Simson, Dean of College of Arts and Sciences, RIC Thomas Bovis, RI Dept. of Administration, Division of
L4 L5 L6	Chairman, Francis T. O'Brien, Associate Professor, PC Kevin Fitta, Director of Capital Projects, RIC Earl Simson, Dean of College of Arts and Sciences, RIC Thomas Bovis, RI Dept. of Administration, Division of Purchases Michael D. Mitchell, Esq., Chief of Legal Services, RI
14 15 16 17	Chairman, Francis T. O'Brien, Associate Professor, PC Kevin Fitta, Director of Capital Projects, RIC Earl Simson, Dean of College of Arts and Sciences, RIC Thomas Bovis, RI Dept. of Administration, Division of Purchases Michael D. Mitchell, Esq., Chief of Legal Services, RI Dept. of Administration
14 15 16 17 18	Chairman, Francis T. O'Brien, Associate Professor, PC Kevin Fitta, Director of Capital Projects, RIC Earl Simson, Dean of College of Arts and Sciences, RIC Thomas Bovis, RI Dept. of Administration, Division of Purchases Michael D. Mitchell, Esq., Chief of Legal Services, RI Dept. of Administration
14 15 16 17 18	Chairman, Francis T. O'Brien, Associate Professor, PC Kevin Fitta, Director of Capital Projects, RIC Earl Simson, Dean of College of Arts and Sciences, RIC Thomas Bovis, RI Dept. of Administration, Division of Purchases Michael D. Mitchell, Esq., Chief of Legal Services, RI Dept. of Administration  Robert P. Brooks, Esquire, Legal Counsel  IRONS & ASSOCIATES
14 15 16 17 18	Chairman, Francis T. O'Brien, Associate Professor, PC Kevin Fitta, Director of Capital Projects, RIC Earl Simson, Dean of College of Arts and Sciences, RIC Thomas Bovis, RI Dept. of Administration, Division of Purchases Michael D. Mitchell, Esq., Chief of Legal Services, RI Dept. of Administration  Robert P. Brooks, Esquire, Legal Counsel  IRONS & ASSOCIATES CERTIFIED PROFESSIONAL STENOGRAPHERS 33 Rollingwood Drive
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Chairman, Francis T. O'Brien, Associate Professor, PC Kevin Fitta, Director of Capital Projects, RIC Earl Simson, Dean of College of Arts and Sciences, RIC Thomas Bovis, RI Dept. of Administration, Division of Purchases Michael D. Mitchell, Esq., Chief of Legal Services, RI Dept. of Administration  Robert P. Brooks, Esquire, Legal Counsel  IRONS & ASSOCIATES CERTIFIED PROFESSIONAL STENOGRAPHERS

1	APPEARANCES:	PAGE	
2	Nathaniel Ginsburg, AIA Brewster Thornton Group	8	
3	Architects Christian J. Ladds, AIA, LLB Architects	18	
4	Raymond Keough	44	
5			
6	PUBLIC COMMENT:	PAGE	
7	Gregory A. Mancini Michael Sabitoni	51 58	
8	Roy Coulombe Scott Duhamel	79 78	
9	SCOLL Dunamer	10	
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			

1		EXHIBITS	
2	NO.	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
3	1	RIC PLA Review Committee Report	6
4	2A	Email from Ben Brubeck	6
5	2B	Letter from Ben Brubeck	6
6	3	Letter from Michael Sabatoni	6
7	4	Letter from Gregory Mancini	7
8	5	Sign-in Sheet	80
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			

Thursday, June 19, 2014. 1 2 (Commencing at 11:40 a.m.) 3 MR. BROOKS: We're going to open up the hearing, the public hearing of the Rhode Island 4 5 College Project Labor Agreement Review Committee. Today is Thursday, July -- strike 6 7 that, June 19th, 2014, and this committee hearing was 8 publicly noticed on the Secretary of State's website as well as Robert Hall. 9 10 My name is Robert Brooks. I'm the 11 legal counsel to the committee, and I'll be sort of 12 leading things today but I would ask each committee 13 member, if they could, starting on the far end of the 14 table, to identify themselves for the record. 15 MR. MITCHELL: My name is Mike Mitchell. I 16 am Chief of Legal Services at the Rhode Island 17 Department of Administration. 18 MR. O'BRIEN: Frank O'Brien, Director of the 19 Quirk Institute at Providence College. 20 MR. SIMSON: Earl Simson, Dean of Arts and 21 Sciences, Rhode Island College. 22 MR. FITTA: Kevin Fitta, Director of Capital 23 Projects, Rhode Island College. 24 MR. BOVIS: Tom Bovis, Departmental Project

Manager, Division of Purchases, Department of Administration.

MR. BROOKS: The agenda for today's committee hearing, public hearing, we're going to begin by receiving presentations from the architects on the two phases of the project, the first being the architect on the Fogarty Building, and that will be followed by the architect for the renovations and modernization of Gaige Hall and Craig-Lee Hall.

presentation, there will be questions from myself and, if required, from the committee members. After that, we will take comments from the public. If you see anyone come in, they can sign in but we've already asked members of the public who want to speak to sign in.

Just keep in mind everyone who speaks, members of the committee, the architects, we do have a stenographer who's taking down everything so if you go too fast, she'll slow you down so that she can get everything down on the record.

Before we take any testimony, I'm going to enter some exhibits. The first is legal counsel's report to the Rhode Island Project Labor Agreement

Review Committee and that report was distributed this
past Monday to the committee for review. And I'm
going to ask the stenographer to enter this as
Exhibit 1.

(Exhibit No. 1 was marked.)
MR. BROOKS: The public notice of the

MR. BROOKS: The public notice of the meeting also asked if there were members of the public who had any comments that they wanted to give to the committee in writing, that they could put those in by yesterday at the end of business, and I have a few that I'd like to enter into the record.

The first is an email and a letter from Ben Brubeck. Ben is the Director of Labor and Federal Procurement, Government Affairs of the Associated Builders and Contractors of America. And I would ask that the email be entered as Exhibit 2A and his letter be entered as 2B.

(Exhibit Nos. 2A and 2B were marked.)

MR. BROOKS: Next we have a letter to the committee through legal counsel from Michael Sabitoni who is the president of the Rhode Island Building and Construction Trades Council, and I would ask that this be entered as Exhibit 3.

(Exhibit No. 3 was marked.)

MR. BROOKS: Next we have a letter to the committee from legal counsel of Build Rhode Island and it's Director -- Executive Director, Greg Mancini, and I would ask that this be entered as Exhibit 4.

(Exhibit No. 4 was marked.)

MR. BROOKS: Now, I did receive additional correspondence, two or three. I apologize, I forgot them at my office, but we will have possibly two other meetings, definitely one. If there's further need for a public hearing, we have set aside Monday June 23rd for that purpose. Based on the number of speakers, it doesn't seem that will be necessary but we are open to that. And then the committee will meet to consider information presented from the public at a meeting on June 26th and then at that time we will have a stenographer present and we will put those additional letters that we received into the record.

Any questions so far, members of the committee? Okay. So we will begin the presentations.

MR. MITCHELL: If I may, Mr. Brooks, I believe the committee should have a chairperson and I

nominate Mr. O'Brien to serve. 1 2 MR. BROOKS: Do we have second? 3 MR. BOVIS: Second. MR. BROOKS: Seconded by Mr. Bovis. All 4 5 those in favor? (VOICE VOTE TAKEN) 6 7 (UNANIMOUS) MR. BROOKS: Opposed? Okay, Frank, you're 8 9 in charge. 10 MR. O'BRIEN: Thank you, committee members. I would ask our legal counsel to carry on. 11 12 MR. BROOKS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The 13 first speaker that we would like to ask to come 14 forward is the architect for the Fogarty Life 15 Sciences addition and renovations, Nate Ginsburg, 16 from Brewster Thornton Architects. 17 MR. GINSBURG: Thank you. As you already 18 know, I'm Nate Ginsburg, Brewster Thornton 19 Architects. I'm going to go through a very brief 20 summary of the project and outline the systems. 21 The Fogarty Life Science Building is located to the north of the Adams Library and the 22 23 John Clarke Science Building. 24 MR. BROOKS: Nate, may I stop you for a

minute? Would the members of the committee like to sit in the front row? I can't see it from my angle.

I'm going to move down here. I can move to the end here.

MR. GINSBURG: Fogarty Hall is also surrounded by Library Road to the south, a residential neighborhood to the north, and east and west by athletic fields.

The primary goals of the School of

Nursing project are to provide a modern nursing

simulation laboratory or laboratories and to support

the curriculum of the school.

In addition, it's to provide a new identity and a front door to the school. The addition will link to spaces at the first floor of the existing Fogarty Hall as well as expanding the student lounge, upgrading existing classrooms, and upgrading faculty offices within the building.

The proposed addition is to the east of Fogarty Hall on the site of the existing open grass field and the existing parking lot. The area to the south of the building is to be landscaped into an outdoor a plaza as an extension of the lobby and for seasonal events. A new parking lot will be added

on the side and the back.

The functions to be housed in the addition are the main entrance lobby, administrative offices, skills and nursing labs, health assessment labs, simulation labs, as well as debriefing rooms, standardized patient exam rooms, and skills and simulation labs.

Proposed renovations within the building include adding faculty offices at the front, renovating existing classrooms, and having student lounge space and faculty support spaces in the back.

The building will be a slab on grade building with wide-flange structural steel framing and open-web steel joists. Similar to many of the other buildings on the campus, the exterior walls will be constructed of a metal stud backup with brick masonry veneer precast concrete sills, window heads and trim or glazed storefront.

The new entry will provide a prominent face to the School of Nursing with a glass curtain wall and closed lobby.

The site utilities will consist of a new telephone/communications conduit, new electrical feed, new fire and domestic water services, a new

sewer extension in the street and new sewer line to the addition.

The stormwater system through the parking lot will be a closed drainage system of concrete catch basins. Stormwater runoff from the building, landscaping and sidewalks will be collected in several rain gardens around the proposed addition.

The mechanical spaces in this area and on the roof will consist of two gas-fired condensing boilers that pump hot water to the roof-top air handling unit and also to VAV reheat coils, fin tube, and unit heaters.

Cooling will be provided by an air-cooled modular chiller with the chilled water pumped also to the roof-top water air handling units. Air movement will be controlled by zoned VAV boxes and individual reheat coils. The exhaust systems, wherever possible, will be pumped through an energy recovery system. The boilers and modular chillers will be located inside the building with the air handing unit on the roof.

The electrical system will consist of power distribution and branch circuit panel boards, interior and external lighting, lighting controls as

1 required by the energy code, and a new emergency 2 generator, fire alarm. The low voltage systems will 3 consist of tel data and audio video systems. 4 audio video systems will include medical simulation 5 capture and management systems, systems for the playback of these simulations, and laboratory 6 7 presentation systems. The building will be fully sprinkled and the 8 9 existing building will have a modified sprinkler 10 system as part of the renovation. 11 MR. BROOKS: You all set? 12 MR. GINSBURG: Yes. 13 MR. BROOKS: Mr. Ginsburg, first, do you 14 know that value or cost of project? 15 MR. GINSBURG: Right now the construction 16 costs are projected to be \$4 million. A \$6 million 17 bond is the total project cost and after that the 18 total project costs and all the soft costs and 19 indirect costs need to be subtracted, so we are 20 projecting that to be \$4 million. 21 MR. BROOKS: And has a schedule been set for 22 construction? 23 MR. GINSBURG: Not yet. 24 MR. BROOKS: Do you have an approximation of

1 how long the project will take? 2 MR. GINSBURG: We expect it to be a 10- to 12-month project. 3 4 MR. BROOKS: Will the project require that classes be moved or departments that are in that 5 building be moved to other locations during 6 7 construction? 8 MR. GINSBURG: So at the moment, the plan is 9 to construct the addition before we begin the renovations of the interior. The renovations to the 10 11 interior of Fogarty need to be constructed while the 12 building is occupied. 13 There really isn't a lot of time when 14 the building is not occupied, so the hope is that we 15 can alleviate some of the space needs within Fogarty 16 and begin to use the addition while we do the 17 renovations. That all depends on the schedule, so if 18 the schedule lends itself to the renovation of the 19 interior of the building at a different time we might 20 end up modifying that.

MR. BROOKS: Is the goal then to try to do the construction without moving classes or departments?

21

22

23

24

MR. GINSBURG: That's correct. The building

1 will be fully occupied during construction. 2 will be part of the constraints. 3 MR. BROOKS: And at the beginning of your presentation, you mentioned the surrounding features 4 5 of the property. Is there only one access road into the property? Is that Library Road? 6 7 MR. GINSBURG: That's correct. 8 MR. BROOKS: Is there any other way to get 9 to the construction site from the neighborhood in the back or is it just that one road? 10 11 MR. GINSBURG: Not to my knowledge. Is that 12 correct, that that's the only access? 13 MR. FITTA: Library Road is the only road 14 that accesses that building. 15 MR. BROOKS: And in terms of the 16 construction trade that would be required for the 17 addition and for the renovations to the existing 18 structures, do you anticipate how many or roughly 19 what number of the construction trades will be 20 required? 21 MR. GINSBURG: Well, it is a pretty standard 22 commercial project. It will require -- I'm trying to 23 think of what trades won't be involved, but we will

need masons, steel workers, concrete. There's site

1 work so it's a pretty extensive project. It's 2 basically a new building that we're going to attach 3 to the old building. 4 MR. BROOKS: So there's really no trades 5 excluded that you can surmise right now? MR. GINSBURG: Correct. 6 7 MR. BROOKS: Do the committee members have 8 any question? Yes, Michael. 9 MR. MITCHELL: As to the lab space, is this generic lab space or is it a special type of lab 10 11 space? Does it require any special piping or other 12 features? 13 MR. GINSBURG: It's a specialty medical lab 14 space but there will not be fully operational medical 15 gear, so while they have all of the equipment to run 16 medical gasses, there won't actually be medical 17 gasses there. 18 They work on simulation dummies that 19 are designed to simulate what a patient would -- how 20 they would react, so while they are very specialized 21 simulation labs, there's no medical gases. There's nothing there that wouldn't be there for a standard 22

MR. MITCHELL: Any provisions for handling

office building with a high level of electronics.

23

```
of hazardous materials or chemicals on this project?
 1
 2
                MR. GINSBURG: There won't be any hazardous
 3
       materials.
 4
                MR. MITCHELL: Now, do you envision putting
 5
       this out as a stand-alone construction design
       bid-type of contract?
 6
 7
                MR. GINSBURG: I think that's still under
       discussion.
 8
 9
                MR. MITCHELL: Okay. Is this project going
       to be bundled with the other two projects that are
10
11
       ongoing?
12
                MR. GINSBURG: No. The intent is actually
13
       to try to get this going first so that we can
14
       actually get to a significant phase in this
15
       construction before the other two start.
16
                MR. MITCHELL: So it would be a separate
17
       contract?
18
                MR. GINSBURG: Absolutely.
19
                MR. MITCHELL: Okay.
20
                MR. BROOKS: Anything else from any other
21
       committee members?
22
                MR. MITCHELL: One more. This is a single
23
       story?
24
                MR. GINSBURG: The existing building, from
```

the upper level, there's two stories. There's sort 1 2 of a half of a large story, so along the west side, it's three stories and on the east side, where we're 3 connecting, is two stories. With the addition it's 4 5 three stories. 6 MR. MITCHELL: And that's currently an open 7 field; is that correct? 8 MR. GINSBURG: Correct. 9 MR. MITCHELL: Are there any restraints as to the site conditions for access by way -- other 10 11 than only being accessed by Library Road, any site 12 constraints? 13 MR. GINSBURG: As far as contractor staging, the area back here is not constrained so we would be 14 15 able to give that over to the contractor. And, 16 actually, for most of the building site we would need 17 to maintain a walkway along Library Road, but the 18 building site is isolated in a way which makes it a 19 little more difficult to get to but also allows us to 20 turn that over to the contractor. 21 MR. MITCHELL: Thank you. MR. BROOKS: None of the committee members 22 23 have anything else? Thank you, Mr. Ginsburg.

MR. GINSBURG: Thank you.

1 MR. BROOKS: The next presentation will be 2 by Chris Ladds of LLB, the architect for the 3 construction and addition to Gaige Hall and Craig-Lee Hall. 4 MR. LADDS: Thank you. This is a site plan 5 showing the locations of these two projects, and they 6 7 are both very prominent academic buildings on campus. 8 Gaige Hall is situated on the west end 9 of the mall, Craig-Lee at the east end, and a very prominent mall space. Both of these buildings are 10 11 mid-century buildings. They had additions shortly after their initial construction. 12 13 Most of the systems are older. They 14 have been upgraded; however, the systems essentially 15 need to be replaced in the buildings and 16 modernization of these buildings really needs to 17 occur not only with the systems but also with the 18 space --19 MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Ladds, if I could, could 20 you explain what you mean by systems? 21 particular systems? 22 MR. LADDS: Okay. Building systems which 23 would include mechanical, electrical, plumbing, HVAC,

and mechanical and finishes. Structural upgrades

will occur in construction with additions as necessary. And that's a good question because I'm not going get into the details of the systems in my presentation, but I could if need be.

MR. MITCHELL: Well, you used the term systems. That's a fairly generic term and for those of us who may not be in the building trades --

MR. LADDS: Does that clarify it?

MR. MITCHELL: Yes.

MR. LADDS: So upgrades not only with systems but programs. These days academic buildings need to function differently from when they were first built in the '60s, mid-century, so we're looking for different ways to accommodate current learning environment needs.

We're certainly considering solar orientation and other environmental factors. One of the other factors we're looking at is pedestrian and vehicular movement. You can see that vehicular movement all around the buildings. Gaige Hall is connected fairly significantly with vehicular traffic; however, Craig-Lee is -- has a small connection here and has some parking and loading type of activity in this courtyard which we are intending

to convert. This is zooming in a little bit. You can see the network of pedestrian circulation, very critical to these buildings.

And here are the main, major pathways. The visibility of Gaige Hall is significant, particularly from the east side of the mall and parking entrance. Also note here that with this addition, they did not connect the upper floor. That's a significant problem in the building that they have been living with for decades and that our project hopes to resolve.

You can also see the prominence of this facade. We're seeing a lot of potential in making this building more fully participate in the campus environment. You can see the building not only from the exterior views out, so there's this interconnectivity that we're hoping to capitalize on, the connection between the buildings and the campus.

Craig-Lee, as you can see, has exposure all around and we're sort of trying to find the orientations of Craig-Lee as we work on modifying, renovating and adding to these building.

This is a view from the west, and it occupies a prominent position at the end of the mall.

We feel like it's a little weak. We're hoping, again, with our addition to this facade, to help strengthen the termination which is very important, the termination of this mall.

The band of -- the colored band around Craig-Lee is where we are identifying the most prominent elevations. You have a project here that has created a very optimum condition for exposure as well.

That's the mall end. And then looking out you have a lot of green areas and green space around it. So this has become -- it's essentially a very prominent spot on campus.

And, in addition, you will see that this space here right now, which is right now referred to as the pit, we propose to change and convert into a social space, an exterior room if you will, that will be elevated to the level of the finished floor in Craig-Lee with an addition you'll see in the area.

This will become a social space and one of the things we're trying to do with both of these buildings is to engage at the ground level of the campus in that type of way.

Again, the entrances on these facades. This

is the floor plan of Gaige, the proposed floor plan.

At the entrance, we're proposing an addition roughly this size. The yellow areas are lounge or study

lounge areas so these areas are new introductions to

Both of these buildings have had some

interventions and a lot of degradation, in other

words, a lot of things moving -- a lot of offices may

be moving into classroom spaces that were purposely

built for classrooms, and over the years this

the program that exists there.

diagram for the plans is to reorganize.

organization has developed so our program or our

In the case of Gaige on this side, we have departmental offices and on this side, we have classrooms. We have an A/V help desk on this floor and also on the other floors we have classrooms on this side, and then we're using the central section as a type of mixing box, if you will, for professors and students to mix socially as well as academically and provide that space that is not in the buildings now. This is what I meant earlier by making program provisions and system provisions. This is what requires the additions to those programs.

The existing auditorium that we are in right

now is being made smaller. Right now the auditorium extends out to this section. It's going to have approximately 350 plus or minus seats. One of the reasons we shortened it is because we're modifying the pitch of the auditorium so that those seats that are way in the back will be tilted up and much closer to the speaker so that we have a much more intimate space. That's the way a lot of these new larger academic teaching venues are being built now and it's a much more dynamic and better way to structure a learning environment. It will have reduced seating numbers. But this is also providing breakout space for large events that might occur.

This is an upper-level. You can see the organization is very similar. On the second floor we have the academic offices, classrooms on the side, again, with lounge and social space. We have a new stair developed for egress as well as functioning as monumental stairs.

In both of these buildings we felt like there should be some connection with the vertical circulation and the social spaces. What that does is it engages the user as they're moving through the building, not only horizontally but vertically.

This is the connection between -- right now there is no construction, there's no building in this area, so we're proposing this addition. It's a multipurpose space that will have 150 seats. We'll have different ways of configuring this space and also it will be able to function as two classrooms, so this is the way we are connecting the two sides and solving that problem that has been there for decades, disconnect the upper floors. All of these building will have two elevators as well in the event that one fails.

MR. MITCHELL: Do they currently have elevators?

MR. LADDS: Yes, they do. This is the plan, proposed plan for Craig-Lee. Going to the second floor to better illustrate the diagram, like Gaige we are using one side for academic departments. On this side, we're housing larger departments.

And this is a -- this is the original building which was a purpose-built classroom building. The spans as well as the flexibility in this space in this building are very well suited for classrooms. Over the years, as I mentioned before, a lot of these spaces have been converted to offices

and other functions, but we feel that since this is the most appropriate use for this building, the right thing to do is to revert it back to classrooms, and it could be very efficient.

This area here is, again, that mixing space, so between the two we have very active social space with some classrooms. But this is a lounge on all three floors. It varies with openings, and there's communication also with a monumental stair in that area.

But this is in addition, this space right here that on the ground floor looks out. They all look over this courtyard by the ground floor and have direct access to the courtyard. And this part of the building is an addition as well. So the original building is back here. So we will be refacing this building. The elevations and the forms of this building are under development so I haven't included them in this proposal. That would be for a later proposal at a later presentation.

Down now on the ground floor. And one of the objectives of our program is to activate the ground floor and provide a lot of connection between the students, faculty, and campus.

So at ground level we have lounges and a potential cafe in this area. This is a significant opinion of the plan and of the campus because the ground floor from the mall into this open space, there's a lot of traffic, as you saw in the earlier diagrams. So we're seeing a lot of glass, a very transparent lower level here with these lounges and this cafe, very student-centric and a social-centric space as well as on this space here. This will be a glass wall looking out to the courtyard.

We are including some future expansion of shelf space at the lower level and repurposing some of the spaces here for classrooms at the lower level.

And then as you go up, a very similar plan. We have five stories on this section so the size of the building now can accommodate the large departments with the addition. So this continues up two floors. And that's essentially the presentation. Thank you.

MR. BROOKS: Mr. Ladds, I have some questions. This project that you're describing, first of all, is it a single project or two different projects?

MR. LADDS: It's a single project but it

```
1
       will occur in two phases.
 2
                MR. BROOKS: And what is the value of the
       construction, do you know?
 3
 4
                MR. LADDS: We're currently looking at some
 5
       variables in the budget; however, it should be around
       44 million. It's a little bit dependent upon other
 6
 7
       factors that are some moving parts, such as
       developing swing space for classrooms, offices and
 8
 9
       other factors that the college would be able to
10
       better answer.
11
                MR. FITTA: If I may clarify.
12
                MR. BROOKS: Sure.
13
                MR. FITTA: If the 44 is the total project
14
       cost, the construction cost is something less than
15
       that.
16
                MR. BROOKS: Less than that.
17
                MR. FITTA: Yes.
18
                MR. BROOKS: Do you know, Kevin, what it's
19
       going to be?
20
                MR. FITTA: I think we're still working
21
       through some of those details right now.
22
                MR. LADDS: That's correct, sir. That was
23
       the approximate cost, right.
24
                MR. BROOKS: Have you designated or
```

determined a schedule of construction for each phase? 1 MR. LADDS: Roughly, right now, we're 2 looking for a start for Gaige in the summer of '15, 3 4 and then the next phase would be probably the fall of 5 '16 for Craig-Lee. And that's probably a little bit in flux, but... 6 7 MR. MITCHELL: Did you say the fall of '15 or '16? 8 9 MR. LADDS: '16. 10 MR. BROOKS: And that second phase, 11 Craig-Lee, how many months do you estimate that would 12 take? 13 MR. LADDS: I think we're looking at about 14 14 approximately. 15 MR. BROOKS: Will there be any overlap or 16 it's just one and then the other? 17 MR. LADDS: There would probably be 18 mobilization overlap but the idea is to finish one 19 building and we can't do the other until the building 20 is completed, so there really can't be that much of 21 an overlap because we're using one building and -- in 22 other words, some of the programs for Craig-Lee will 23 move into Gaige after Gaige is finished in order to 24 implement the construction of Craig-Lee.

1 MR. BROOKS: Is it -- starting with 2 Craig-Lee, is this a total gut of the building? other words, will students be in the building or will 3 4 they need to be moved out? 5 MR. LADDS: It will be a vacant building and it will essentially be a gut of the finishes, 6 7 certainly, and most of the systems. MR. BROOKS: And so I would assume then 8 9 that -- well, I won't assume anything. The classes, the offices, whatever's in Gaige Hall, those will 10 11 need to be moved elsewhere on campus? 12 MR. LADDS: That's right. 13 MR. BROOKS: In terms of the schedule, is 14 it -- is there any critical aspect to making sure 15 that the schedule run on time? I assume that this 16 construction and the school year, the academic year, 17 needs to flow in a way that makes sense for the 18 college. 19 MR. LADDS: Well, certainly we wouldn't 20 start construction until the end of the semester, 21 after commencement starts, but it is tied into the 22 academic calendar. 23 MR. MITCHELL: Can you explain that, tied

into the academic calendar, how that plays into the

1 construction schedule of the first phase and then how that ties into the construction schedule for the 2 second phase? 3 MR. LADDS: Well, the construction schedule 4 for the first phase would start after the spring 5 semester -- the fall semester -- sorry, the spring 6 7 semester, so it starts after commencement. 8 MR. MITCHELL: So the building is vacated 9 after graduation, correct? 10 MR. LADDS: Correct. 11 MR. MITCHELL: And then you're going to 12 start construction and run that through the following 13 year. When do you anticipate bringing the first 14 phase to completion so the building could be used? 15 MR. LADDS: Probably 14 months after, so we 16 would anticipate for the fall semester. 17 MR. MITCHELL: Okay. Now, let's explain 18 what happens if construction doesn't meet that 19 schedule. How does that impact the -- the next 20 academic year? 21 MR. LADDS: Well, I would leave that to the 22 institution to determine the impact; however, I would 23 anticipate that they would have classes scheduled for

those spaces and I would anticipate that there would

1 be a problem moving classes into those spaces and 2 moving the departments into those spaces. 3 MR. MITCHELL: So is the construction schedule for Phase 1 of some significance to the --4 5 to academic programs and the beginning of Phase 2? MR. LADDS: I would say so. 6 7 MR. MITCHELL: And if there's a delay in the opening of completion of Phase 1, will there then be 8 9 a delay in the commencement of Phase 2? 10 MR. LADDS: I would anticipate that one 11 would follow the other. 12 MR. MITCHELL: Thank you. 13 MR. LADDS: They are not an independent, 14 isolated occurrence. 15 MR. MITCHELL: Is that because the college 16 needs as much space as it can have available for 17 classes and the academic schedule? 18 MR. LADDS: Yes. And also there are 19 departments that need to be housed. So some of the 20 departments will move back into Craig-Lee -- I'm 21 sorry, some will be moved back into Gaige. Some will 22 move from Craig-Lee to Gaige. 23 MR. BROOKS: So making sure I understand 24 this, classes and offices that might be engaged, some of those will move into Craig-Lee during the first phase of construction and vice versa during the second phase, classes or --

MR. LADDS: I'm not in charge of the moving around; however, I don't believe we're moving that much into Craig-Lee. I believe it's going other places on campus. That's not really in our scope, but my understanding is there's other places being found on campus for those that are now in Gaige.

MR. O'BRIEN: So if you did not meet your timeline for Phase 1, would that stymie you with respect to Phase 2? In other words, if Gaige isn't complete for the fall semester of '15, then would that prevent you from beginning the second phase?

MR. LADDS: I can't say for sure, but I would anticipate that it would have an impact unless there were spaces found elsewhere to have both buildings vacant, then I would anticipate that that would delay the beginning of Craig-Lee construction.

MR. FITTA: May I add to this?

MR. MITCHELL: As a member of the committee,
I understand you're familiar with the project, but I
would have a problem with a member of the committee,
I think, testifying.

1 MR. FITTA: Okay.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. MITCHELL: Although we will need some clarification as to the relationship between the academic schedules and moving in and using the space, I don't know whether you're the best person to provide that. But I think we will need some --MR. FITTA: I can provide it at the

appropriate time.

MR. MITCHELL: Okay.

MR. LADDS: I would appreciate it if you could correct me.

MR. BROOKS: Well, I think we do need some testimony from someone at the college familiar with how the scheduling of the classes is going to work with the construction schedule itself and that we should get some testimony on the record for that, and if there's someone else who can do that -- maybe Ray Keough might be able to provide that if he's here.

MR. FITTA: Sure.

MR. BROOKS: We can do that on the 23rd or if he's here, we could do it today.

MR. MITCHELL: Well, we have people who want to testify and we should hear as much as possible about the construction phase, the impact, and how

1 those things interrelate. 2 MR. BROOKS: Right. Kevin, is there anyone else that could provide that today after Mr. Ladds' 3 4 testimony? 5 MR. FITTA: I would ask Ray. Are you prepared to talk about the phasing or is that 6 7 something you would need to talk about at another 8 time? 9 MR. KEOUGH: I didn't bring anything with me to talk about it. If there were general questions, 10 11 we could go through it. But you can't start one 12 project without totally completing the first one. 13 MR. BROOKS: Well, let's get through with 14 Mr. Ladds, and we can take a five-minute recess. 15 MR. BOVIS: Could these be bid as two 16 separate projects? 17 MR. LADDS: Could it be? 18 MR. BOVIS: Yes. 19 MR. LADDS: That would be possible. 20 MR. MITCHELL: Has a decision been made as 21 to how this will be bid, as two separate construction 22 projects, or is it going to be a single project? 23 MR. LADDS: It's a single construction 24 project.

1 MR. MITCHELL: That's the current plan? MR. LADDS: Yes. 2 3 MR. BROOKS: In keeping with the 4 construction, you anticipate that all of the trades 5 of various construction trades will be engaged on 6 this project? 7 MR. LADDS: Yes, I anticipate that. MR. BROOKS: You mentioned a cafe being 8 9 built I think in Craig-Lee? 10 MR. LADDS: Yes. 11 MR. BROOKS: Is that cafe going to be built with full kitchen facilities? 12 13 MR. LADDS: No. That's not anticipated 14 right now. It's an undeveloped part of the program. 15 It's mainly seen as a social space that may be more 16 or less a self-serve type of thing. At this point 17 it's not, you know, a full blown, you know, food 18 service or anything like that at this time. 19 MR. BROOKS: All right. You mentioned at 20 the beginning of your presentation access to these 21 buildings. Based on the construction going on 22 involving pedestrians -- there are prominent spaces 23 on the mall. Will the mall be assessable to the 24 students and faculty and visitors to the school while construction is going on?

MR. LADDS: Certainly, I would -- I'm not going to propose that I've developed an implementation plan for the contractor; however, I would anticipate that there would be fencing around the building and then it will probably go to the back, and you could easily isolate this building as well. This has vehicular access from two sides, so I would assume that a good deal of construction activity would come in from that main area.

MR. BROOKS: In terms of access by vehicles, there's two accesses to Craig-Lee?

MR. LADDS: This is not direct access; however, I am aware of vehicles driving over this area but it's not designated as vehicular access. I mean we have seen that vehicles have driven in this area so I'm assuming it probably H20 paving in that area because it doesn't seem like it's broken apart.

This is loading here for the arts center, so this is clearly vehicular and also it serves the Henry Barnard kitchen as well.

MR. BROOKS: So there would be a requirement to keep that access to the elementary school open?

MR. LADDS: Correct. And I would anticipate

1 that this particular access will probably remain open 2 during construction, and then they would back their way out to landscape and then that's when the access 3 would terminate. So this right now I'm assuming 4 would be the staging area and then when they start to 5 be part of the landscape area, they would back out. 6 7 MR. BROOKS: And so as I'm understanding it, in terms of construction vehicles coming in and out 8 9 of the site, there's just that one access in from I quess the road on that side of the campus? 10 11 MR. LADDS: Right, from the southeast, over 12 here. 13 MR. BROOKS: And switching over to Gaige 14 Hall, the access, is that -- is that Library Road 15 that runs behind that? 16 MR. LADDS: Yes. This road would provide 17 access to this area and perhaps the staging areas 18 which would be on this side. 19 MR. BROOKS: And vehicles entering the 20 campus for construction would come in either from 21 Fruit Hill Avenue or Mount Pleasant Avenue? 22 MR. LADDS: I would say so, but I would 23 probably -- the owner would probably designate one or 24 the other.

```
1
                MR. BROOKS: All right. Does any committee
 2
       member have any questions?
 3
                MR. BOVIS: Is new furniture required for
 4
       these buildings?
 5
                MR. LADDS: Yes.
                MR. BOVIS: Will there been work stations
 6
 7
       installation?
                MR. LADDS: Correct.
 8
 9
                MR. BOVIS: Thank you.
10
                MR. MITCHELL: If I may, there will be
11
       demolition in these buildings, correct?
12
                MR. LADDS: Yes.
13
                MR. MITCHELL: All exterior or exterior and
14
15
                MR. LADDS: You mean all of the interior
16
       for --
17
                MR. MITCHELL: Will there be both?
18
                MR. LADDS: There's both. For Gaige, with
19
       the exception of windows and perhaps window opening
20
       modifications, most of the exterior demolition will
21
       occur at the mall entry area, so we're not doing much
       around the outside.
22
23
                      For Craig-Lee, we're working on the
24
       curtain wall here in this part and we're leaving a
```

lot of the brick and replacing windows only with the exception of certainly an addition here would be removing the exterior where we're putting the addition up to the building.

MR. MITCHELL: Okay. Now, I'm fairly familiar with the campus. I live close enough that I can access the campus, and it's been my experience that it gets a lot of foot traffic both day and night, and it's basically contained space around Craig-Lee Hall in close proximity to the other buildings. Are there concerns about having ongoing major construction at that location and how that will impact the student population as well as the construction that goes on within this area?

MR. LADDS: I would say that I've worked on campuses that are far denser than this, and it's really a constriction that occurs that the contractor needs to respond to. This is not by any means the tightest site I've ever seen. There's a lot of opportunity — there's a lot of space, a lot of opportunity for containing the construction, so I don't anticipate anything involving that. There's a lot of room here and we may need to block off the walkway and have people walk around, but there's a

lot of room.

MR. MITCHELL: Well, is there any impact of construction on instructional activities that goes on in nearby buildings?

MR. LADDS: I would say if there was a concern it might be on the acoustical side, not necessarily impeding pedestrian traffic or anything like that, the general nature of construction being noisy at times.

MR. BROOKS: Will any of the construction need to be done on off hours, whether it's demolition or other construction due to noise concerns?

MR. LADDS: In my experience, working on academic buildings, I don't see that as necessarily being an issue with this project. Perhaps there could be some. I don't anticipate pile driving that I can see. It's going to be mostly power hand tools and that type of thing. Some of the site work could be fairly loud.

MR. MITCHELL: And how about vehicles used for construction purposes? Will there be large vehicles accessing these sites?

MR. LADDS: Yes. There will be concrete trucks, fairly large vehicles to move materials.

There will be unloading, you know, steel, that type 1 of thing. I would -- if I were the contractor, I 2 would probably stage it going this way into this area 3 4 for this project and maybe out front. But, again, 5 this is a means and methods issue that I don't really get that involved with. 6 7 MR. MITCHELL: But safety is an issue for 8 work in this type of area. 9 MR. LADDS: All the OSHA standards will have 10 to be met. You mean safety for pedestrians? 11 MR. MITCHELL: For users of the campus. 12 MR. LADDS: For users of the campus, I don't 13 see anything that can't be taken care of with your 14 standard construction fence regarding safety and 15 redirection of traffic. 16 MR. BROOKS: You mentioned demolition. Will 17 there be interior demolition of both buildings 18 required? 19 MR. LADDS: Yes. 20 MR. BROOKS: Will there be any hazardous 21 materials that will need to be removed, asbestos or 22 23 MR. LADDS: We have a study and there are 24 some hazardous materials and that would be part of

the project. The survey will be put into the construction documents.

MR. MITCHELL: I'm pondering the relationship between the Henry Barnard School and the construction site because while the college campus is — they have a long academic schedule, that school has a different academic schedule so you're going to have the elementary school kids going by the Craig-Lee Hall during construction; am I correct?

MR. LADDS: Well, the Henry Barnard School playground -- you are correct. My kids actually went to school here, so I -- it's here, and then the entry is down here. It is an issue that would have to be dealt with. There's no question there's going to have to be a safety process and a clear definition of what's the job site and what's not.

MR. MITCHELL: And everyone involved in that is going to have to be aware of that issue.

MR. LADDS: That's correct. I don't mean to downplay the need for concern. I feel like there are solutions that are not -- it's not in any way insurmountable, but I agree that attention has to be paid to the way in which these projects are going to be implemented.

1 MR. MITCHELL: If I'm not mistaken, it's a 2 little bit different than the Fogarty Building site 3 which is an open field. 4 MR. LADDS: That's correct, much more in the 5 heart of campus. MR. BROOKS: Any other committee members? 6 7 Thank you, Mr. Ladds. Mr. Chairman, if I could 8 suggest, before we take comments from the public, 9 that we take a five-minute recess so that we can 10 determine whether we can get into today's hearing 11 some testimony about how the project and the academic 12 scheduling relate. 13 MR. O'BRIEN: Yes. 14 MR. BROOKS: Thank you. We'll take a 15 five-minute recess. 16 (Recess.) 17 MR. BROOKS: I call the committee back into 18 the session and call the meeting back into order. 19 We're going to ask Raymond Keough, 20 from Keough Construction, to speak to some of the 21 questions that committee members had about the impact 22 of the delays during the phases of the project. 23 Mr. Keough, could you identify 24 yourself for the record.

1 MR. KEOUGH: Raymond Keough. I'm the owner 2 of Keough Construction. We provide owners project 3 manager services to the state of Rhode Island. 4 MR. BROOKS: Are you providing owners 5 representation for this project, for the Craig-Lee and Gaige Hall renovations and modernization? 6 7 MR. KEOUGH: Yes, we are. MR. BROOKS: Committee members can ask their 8 9 questions, but I'll start off. There was concern 10 first with the impact of the schedule, and we heard 11 from Mr. Ladds that the schedule was to begin with 12 the first phase of the project with the construction 13 of Gaige Hall in the summer of 2015; is that correct? 14 MR. KEOUGH: That's correct. 15 MR. BROOKS: And that would run, I think, 16 about 14 months, and then Craig-Lee would begin in 17 the fall of 2016, correct? 18 MR. KEOUGH: Correct. 19 MR. BROOKS: About a 28 or 29 month overall 20 span? 21 MR. KEOUGH: Overall, yup. 22 MR. BROOKS: Do you have an understanding, 23 Mr. Keough, of what the plan is for classes and 24 offices that are in Craig-Lee and what's going to

happen to them?

MR. KEOUGH: Well, I don't have an absolute detail because there's many different departments in both buildings. The goal of the project is to put all the departments together. I do know, however, that in order to start the second building, the first one has to be completed so that everyone will move out of Craig-Lee and into Gaige for the second part of this project.

MR. BROOKS: So the second phase, in the fall of 2016, couldn't begin until the first phase of construction of Gaige Hall is completed?

MR. KEOUGH: That's correct.

MR. BROOKS: And if, let's say, with the first part of the project if there's a delay in the construction of Gaige Hall and that goes into the academic year of the fall of 2016, what would be the ramifications of that?

MR. KEOUGH: Well, first of all, the kids could not occupy the building so we would be planning on the students being in that building at the time. So if they couldn't go in the building, we would have to make some other alternative arrangements. It would be a significant impact.

Right now there's very little what we call swing space available on the campus, which is places where you can put students while you're doing renovations in a particular building, so if we were planning on being ready, we wouldn't have the space available.

MR. BROOKS: Because, if I understand, with not much swing space available, it will be being used up with those offices and classes that have swung out of Gaige Hall?

MR. KEOUGH: Correct.

MR. BROOKS: So Craig-Lee couldn't move into this swing space because the other building is in it?

MR. KEOUGH: Correct.

MR. BROOKS: In terms of the second phase, Craig-Lee, if the construction is delayed past the beginning of the fall semester, would the school be able to start construction at any time or would they have to wait until the end of the semester?

MR. KEOUGH: I would -- my firm would recommend that you wait. You want to minimize the interaction between students and construction activities. I wouldn't recommend starting work on a building that has any students at all in it.

1 MR. BROOKS: So that would mean that the 2 second phase wouldn't start until --3 MR. KEOUGH: The spring of '17. MR. BROOKS: -- the spring semester, which 4 starts, say, in January of 2017? 5 MR. KEOUGH: Yes. 6 7 MR. BROOKS: In terms of the cost estimates 8 for the project, would those kind of delays -- what 9 impact would that be on the cost of the project? 10 MR. KEOUGH: Well, we provide a lot of 11 estimating services for the college and we typically 12 include a price escalation clause or a percentage of 13 the overall construction because of inflation and 14 other consumer prices that affect the materials of 15 construction. There's -- the fellows in the field get a raise every year, however, whatever collective 16 17 bargaining agreements they have, so all those things 18 add to the cost of a job. 19 A job that's right now this long we're 20 going ask the contracting community to commit to a 21 plus or minus 30-month window of construction, so 22 they're going to take some business risks to get the

Every time you delay that, you're

23

24

job done on time.

1 going to incur more management fees from the 2 contractor, you'll incur management fees from the architect to stand on board to support a delayed 3 schedule. Typically, they require construction 4 5 administration there on site doing things. I can testify on my behalf you would have to give me more 6 7 money to stick around, but -- so you want to try to 8 avoid those things. 9 MR. BROOKS: Any other questions? MR. MITCHELL: Are you involved in other 10 11 construction projects on other college campuses? 12 MR. KEOUGH: Yeah, we are. We're doing a 13 significant amount of work at the University of Rhode Island. 14 15 MR. MITCHELL: And have you experienced any 16 construction delays on the URI project? 17 MR. KEOUGH: We have, yes, sir. 18 MR. MITCHELL: Do you know whether it has 19 impacted URI's academic schedules when they have

MR. KEOUGH: It has impacted and we've been able to manage it. The only significant project that got delayed was a wellness center, which was more of a fitness area, but the college pharmacy opened on

20

21

22

23

24

project delays?

time. We're working on the chemistry project right now which has a PLA. It seems to be on time and on schedule.

MR. MITCHELL: So you've have experience with PLA projects?

MR. KEOUGH: Yes, sir. We have a PLA at the chemistry building. We were also involved with CVS when we had PLAs for two large projects for CVS up in the Highland Industrial Corporate Park.

MR. MITCHELL: Now, we've seen site plans with the campus and the areas where there will be construction. Are there any special considerations with this type of construction on the college campus or in a setting where you have colleges and an elementary school?

MR. KEOUGH: Yes, sir, there are. And that's part of the reconstruction process. As Chris Ladds was up here earlier, one of the documents that will be in the bid set will actually be a site logistics plan that will actually explain to the contractors that are bidding the job which show a fencing drawing that fences in each building. We will spend time with Rhode Island College creating the most safe travel for construction vehicles.

We'll identify areas where construction vehicles will 1 park for all the workers. They probably won't be 2 able to fit on the site so we're going to need to 3 identify a space for them to park. We've done that 4 at the University of Rhode Island on almost every 5 6 project so there's like a central area. 7 So we'll come up and get approved by 8 Rhode Island College the document that controls the 9 flow of traffic in and out of the sites. 10 MR. BROOKS: Do any committee members have 11 any question? 12 MR. BOVIS: You mentioned escalation. What 13 has escalation been trending in the last few years in 14 the construction industry? 15 MR. KEOUGH: It's a little scary. In '13 it was a lot. It was north of 10 percent. It was 16 17 probably closer to 13 percent. So we saw a lot of 18 projects that got budgeted in late '12 and early '13 19 that really took significant hits. This year we 20 think it's much lower. It's in the threes, 3 and a 21 half per percent. But I think that's what we would 22 carry going forward.

23 MR. BROOKS: Any other questions from the committee? Thank you. At this time we're going --

1 thank you, Mr. Keough.

2 MR. KEOUGH: Thank you.

MR. BROOKS: At this time we're going to call members of the public who have signed up to speak. The first one we're going to call is Greg Mancini from Build Rhode Island.

MR. MANCINI: For the record, Greg Mancini from Build Rhode Island. Thank you for having me.

Build Rhode Island is a trade
association comprised of three contractor
associations; The Association of General Contractors,
The National Electric Contractors Association, and
The New England Mechanical Contractors Association,
and members of the Rhode Island Building &
Construction Trades Council.

I had submitted a nine-page paper

based on your initial request for information, and

along with that I have provided you with 32 exhibits.

24 of those exhibits are actual testaments from

construction users who have used PLAs and have been

successful. I'm not going to go into my 9-page

paper. Hopefully, you'll all read it.

I will comment on one of the exhibits

I provided and that's a letter from Brown University.

Brown University, right now their policy is any project over \$5 million is going to be an all-year project with a memorandum of understanding, and in total, to date, we have probably constructed about a quarter of a million dollars worth of construction activity at Brown. They were all union, mostly under Project Labor Agreements or memorandum of understanding.

One of the reasons why -- well, several reasons why, but one of the reasons is I think universities are unique. Colleges are unique. The time schedule is critical. One of the values of a PLA that I talk about in my paper is PLAs increase certainty. They increase cost certainty and probably more important for your purposes, they increase schedule certainty. It's one component on a long list of variables that provide certainty for you. At Brown, our views have worked I think because of that critical component of schedule certainty.

I know what the state law says relative to you entering into a PLA. We're talking about large and complex projects. Clearly, Gaige and Craig-Lee are large projects and certainly they're very complex and I think in particular for a university because of

your scheduling component of classes, things like that.

In addition, you have obviously a school here and safety is a critical component. Safety, obviously, is — the safety plans are completed by the — your project managers. There are people who are running equipment, and you have students around, possibly young kids. Safety is going to be very important for you. It includes statistics on safety.

From 1998 to 2013, there have been 35 fatalities in the construction industry in our state and just three were union workers, and this is despite the fact that usually it's union workers and union contractors that are working on the most perilous jobs site. So I think that is an important component for you to consider in your analysis.

I do want to touch on Fogarty for a minute.

I didn't hear how much that project was worth. It
seems like it was far less. I would point out two
things. A couple of things on that is it's a
standard project. I was told or there was testimony
to that fact that there will be a number of trades in
that, 16 construction trade unions. I know we have a
number of collective bargaining agreements that will

be expiring during the term of that project, even though it will be relatively short.

At Brown University, just so you know, we've done projects as low as \$2 million, \$4 million, so even though you wouldn't think of a 2 or a \$4 million project as overly large, I think because it's on a university campus and there are other heightened schedule concerns, I think it takes a more -- I think it's more heightened or that the threshold shouldn't be lowered.

So I know that the Fogarty Building project is probably more than that but at Brown, again, every project over \$5 million is going to be an all-union project with a memorandum of understanding. So I think one of the reasons is certainly quality of work force but also I think schedule issues.

Other than that, I'm not going to comment on that. If you have questions for me, I'm more than happy to take them. I know a number or couple of you I've testified before you. I think you've seen our package. I don't think there's -- I know there's a lot of studies on PLAs. I don't know of one study on a PLA that analyzes any project from Rhode Island pro or con. The only evidence I've seen on the success

or failure of PLAs is really twofold; number one, the fact that they are used which, to me, is the prima facie evidence that they have value, but even more than that is the comments from construction users and owners that we have included in the package. Every one is — has had a good experience with PLAs here in the state of Rhode Island.

I've ever seen that says PLAs have an adverse impact on any project in Rhode Island, increased costs, nothing. But on the other hand, there's ample evidence that PLAs, when implemented for the reasons that they are needed, have been successful. So with that I will close and if anyone has questions, I'm more than happy to answer them.

MR. BROOKS: Members of the committee?

MR. MITCHELL: If I may, Mr. Mancini, one of the concerns raised by the Supreme Court and one of the criteria in our State Purchases Act 37-2-2 is that the procurement system is supposed to provide increased economy in state and public agency procurement activities by fostering effective competition. There is concerns, or there should be a concern as to whether if we have a PLA, there would

be a sufficient number of general contractors in the Rhode Island market who would be able to bid competitively on these projects. Do you have any insight as to whether competition would be inhibited by a PLA?

MR. MANCINI: I have a couple of comments.

The first comment I'll make is that the Supreme Court made that conclusion without any evidence but, nevertheless, they made that conclusion.

The second comment is government — unlike the private sector, government can't discriminate against contractors based on their collective bargaining relationships, so any non-union contractor is just as eligible provided they meet all your other bidding criteria. They're just as eligible to bid on this project as union contractors.

The third comment I'll make is that we have a directory. The last time I checked there was 800 some odd contractors in our directory. And, lastly, I'll make the comment that although it was a little bigger project, the opponents of the PLA readily admitted that they don't have enough contractors in their stable that could really bond for that job.

Actually, one other comment I'll make on

Commission had -- I believe it was a couple of years ago, but they concluded that there would be no adverse impact on competition because all the contractors who are capable of doing this job are union contractors. So I think that's -- I still think that's the case, by the way, although I must admit it's an anecdotal conclusion on my part, but I think it's supported by some testimony from the last public hearing as well as some conclusions from the Kent County Courthouse Study Commission.

MR. MITCHELL: So it would be your opinion that it would not adversely impact competition for these contracts?

MR. MANCINI: Yeah. I would say that, number one, non-union contractors, if there are some out there, they're certainly eligible to bid, and number two is I think regardless, the majority, if not all of the contractors that are able to bid on this project or a certain amount of this project are signatory contractors.

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you.

MR. BROOKS: Do any other members of the committee have any questions for Mr. Mancini? Thank

you. The next speaker is Mike Sabatini from the Rhode Island Building Trades.

MR. SABITONI: Thank you. Members of the committee, for the record, my name is Michael Sabatoni. I am president of the Rhode Island Building & Construction Trades Council representing close to about 10,000 construction workers in and around the state of Rhode Island.

Throughout history we've constructed basically any or every structure of significance in the state of Rhode Island and it's our hopes that we will construct this as well.

As well. I have been in front of a few of you before in similar studies to see if a PLA is feasible. It is my recommendation to this committee and my expertise in the construction industry that this a feasible project for a Project Labor Agreement along the lines of the testimony I heard from the architects of the scheduling, etc. and the necessity of the safety and coordination and the certainty that Project Labor Agreements bring to the owner and client, in this case being Rhode Island College.

In our history we have negotiated billions of dollars worth of construction activity under Project Labor Agreements, and I think in the recent history here at Rhode Island College, if you ask some of the leadership of the college if they could go back and turn the clock back on some recent construction activity here, would they have liked to have a Project Labor Agreement for those projects, even some of them a little smaller than the ones we're discussing here today, I think the answer might be yes.

And I have first-hand knowledge of that due to the fact that some of the contractors that we have that were under other contractors here, some of the difficulties and my intersession to try and help to expedite and make sure that we keep the construction on track.

And I believe because of that, a

Project Labor Agreement provides for the

standardization of terms and conditions, it provides

for mechanisms to expedite and resolve disputes, and

it also provides, as my colleague has mentioned,

certainty to the owner and the client that

construction will continue under one umbrella, under

one master agreement, with the coordinated efforts of the contractors and subcontractors along with the architects and owners reps, as well as the building trades as a whole. And I believe because of that certainty, again, that's why it makes so much sense for this project.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I heard some questions while I was sitting in the audience with regards to sound and some other engineering results that we might need to take into consideration. Again, a Project Labor Agreement allows, during the term of that agreement, for a labor management committee to meet at any time to discuss, as projects evolve and they are ever changing, conditions that might arise in the hopes and the result to find a solution of whatever the issue might be as well as, as I was looking at the renderings of what we're about to undertake, which is usually an issue, especially at Brown University and other campuses, issues such as parking and the coordination of getting tradesmen and women to and from the work site which I'm sure will also be an issue here. That we negotiate directly into the agreements with the coordination of the employees through the contractors that they work for which is

also, again, a big consideration, especially for an educational institution.

Contrary to belief, during the life of this construction schedule, we're going to get busy again. The construction industry in Rhode Island has been severely impacted since 2008. We have had a real tough time with unemployment getting as high as maybe the low 40s across the board, 40 percent unemployment, but in light of what we have recently seen in the last few days at the state house and also the fact that we are here today in front of this committee and we've been in front of others, construction is on the rise, and we will see that trend as we get into '15 and '16 continue to escalate.

And to get back to the certainty on that,
the certainty is with a Project Labor Agreement with
the building trades is that we're guaranteed to man
these projects and we will man them. And as the
demand increases, we've lost some membership, you
will have the mechanism to bring in additional
workers through a bonafide trained workforce via our
apprenticeship and training programs that we all have
to meet the future demands of the industry and the

projects.

You heard Mr. Keough mention CVS, and I was the lead negotiator in my capacity as president to negotiate that project agreement or those couple of project agreements up at CVS.

And one interesting thing that happened during the life of those projects was that two of the trades came to impasse at the expiration of their collective bargaining agreements during the life of those projects. One was the Carpenters Union, Local Union 94, and the other was the Plumbers and Pipefitters, Local Union 51.

And the reason why CVS decided to do a

Project Labor Agreement as a private for-profit

company with shareholders was because it made

business sense, and the proof of the business sense

was while those contracts came to expiration and

impasse and those crafts went out on strike, those

projects were not impacted because Project Labor

Agreements were in place and they had to guarantee to

man and continue to man that project and a few others

around the state. I think at the same time it was

the T.F. Green Airport Intermodal Project as well was

under a similar agreement and that project was not

impacted as well.

Some people say that these are all union agreements and nothing could be further from the truth. As my colleague, Mr. Mancini, has said, any contractor can bid, any subcontractor can bid. As long as they adhere to the terms and conditions of the agreement, they can bid and work on this project.

One of the largest open shop merit bridge contractors in the United States was in Rhode Island that did the Phase 1 of the Newport Bridge -- Phase 1 of the Pell Bridge project about four years ago. He came to town, we reached out to him, we sat down, and we negotiated a Project Labor Agreement for that project. It was an open shop general contractor that took half of his work force from across the country to come here to work side by side with tradesmen and women of the Rhode Island Building & Construction Trades Council.

So that project exercised two disclaimers; number one, that whether you're a union contractor or non-union contractor, if you agree to work under the terms and conditions, it's union neutral.

The second is that the phobia that you have to only use union workers couldn't be further from

the truth. I believe Mr. Mancini's evidence to the committee also has a letter. While I was negotiating the Project Labor Agreement for the University of Rhode Island chem lab, the misnomer or disclaimer that key personnel for companies can work under Project Labor Agreements and there is no paying of dual benefits and some and the other phobias that you hear from the merit side of the industry on why PLAs are cost prohibitive.

So, in my opinion, you're looking at three projects, and I know two should be fit together because of the time and scope and the need to have one done and start the other and the coordination of efforts.

I just might convey to the committee you might want to consider putting all three together and see that you might get a better outcome on your cost, because if you're going to have a management team here that's going to be managing 40 million worth of construction on two places and there's an additional 4 or \$5 million project over here, it might be in the committee's interest to say let's just get one construction manager, lump them all together. You'll have certainty terms and conditions on all three

projects on whatever may arise, and I just offer that as a consideration for the committee if you wish to do so.

In closing, since 2008 -- and if you decide that a Project Labor Agreement is feasible, in my capacity as president, I will lead the committee in negotiating those agreements. And they have become pretty standardized with exceptions that we put into place with things relevant, again, to parking and timing and scheduling, etc. But I will be the one that will lead that committee if you reach that conclusion to negotiate a Project Labor Agreement.

And just, again, in closing, right now we have three public works PLAs that are on time, that are on budget, that the owner has not experienced any disruptions. There have been disputes on those projects but they are quickly resolved with the mechanisms contained in those agreements to the extent where I don't even think the owner knows that there might even be an issue or two on a project.

And that's the real reason why, as an institution and a user of construction services, you consider these type of arrangements both public and private because it's in the best interest of you, the

1 client. 2 So with that, I'll close. I would be happy to answer any of your questions and I thank you for 3 4 your time today. 5 MR. BROOKS: Mr. Sabatoni, I have a few 6 questions to start off. You mentioned you represent 10,000 members in the construction trade unions? 7 8 MR. SABITONI: That's correct. 9 MR. BROOKS: How many construction trade unions are there? 10 11 MR. SABITONI: There are 17. 12 MR. BROOKS: Thank you. And this 13 construction is scheduled to begin summer of 2015 and 14 run, at least with respect to the timing of the 15 Craig-Lee and Gaige project, for 28 months. If you 16 know, will there be collective bargaining agreements 17 impacting the different trades that will be expiring 18 during that period? 19 MR. SABITONI: Absolutely. Actually, 20 there's one expiring on Tuesday that we had a meeting 21 this morning on that potentially could reach impasse. 22 MR. BROOKS: Okay. And you mentioned that 23 on the CVS project a PLA prevented a negative impact

or an adverse impact on that project, there were

24

expirations of a collective bargaining agreement on that project. Could you just comment on how a PLA would benefit the project if some of the union collective bargaining agreements expired during the term of this project?

MR. SABITONI: If the owner authorizes or decided that a Project Labor Agreement is in its best interest, then once we execute that agreement, for the life of this project the scope that's contained in the Project Labor Agreement, should any of those collective bargaining agreements expire during that duration, those local unions are obligated legally to man these projects.

So if they're at impasse at all those sites around the state then those projects will be impacted, but if there's a Project Labor Agreement in place on these projects, they will not be impacted.

MR. BROOKS: So let me take the other side and ask you about that. If there were no PLAs on the project and there was a job action where one of the unions wasn't going to work because their contract had expired, could you comment, based on your knowledge in the industry, your leadership role as a union official, how that would impact the project

without a PLA?

MR. SABITONI: Unfortunately, in the construction industry, that happens quite frequently from time to time, whether it's site specific or sometimes a demonstration or a picket line or a community standard awareness where there are disruptions on projects from time to time. It doesn't necessarily have to be the expiration of the collective bargaining agreement. We can have a whole workforce go out on strike, so there even are site specific things from time to time where demonstrations, etc. impact the project and delay construction activity.

Usually, when that happens, if that's one craft or a couple of crafts that get together and do that, then there's usually a disruption on that site. It might be for as little as a day, a week, but there still is a disruption should that occur.

That would not occur here, again, because you have the terms and conditions laid out and these entities know that there will be a severe impact or penalty on their organizations should they do so if there is a Project Labor Agreement in place.

MR. BROOKS: Okay. You are familiar with

the term reserve gate?

MR. SABITONI: That's correct, yes.

MR. BROOKS: The reserve gate would be set up -- if a subcontractor or a company working on a project had a labor dispute with one particular trade, they could set up a reserve gate so that that union would picket that gate but other workers would be able to go into other gates. That would be the case where there was no PLA?

MR. SABITONI: That usually occurs, again, on the site specific scenario I just mentioned, that's correct.

MR. BROOKS: Okay. And in this case where the access to the project seems to be limited by one way in and one way out, would there be a possibility to set up a reserve gate without a PLA in this situation?

MR. SABITONI: I mean when you look at the difficulties of construction sites, one of the things that you always look at is the entrance, how many ways in, how many ways out, especially if you get into a point where people are trying to deter people to go to work and honor and show solidarity or support for whatever their endeavor might be.

So the fact that there's limited access to sites does have an impact on the potential to set up the dual gate system as it's known in the industry, absolutely. The more entryways, the more difficult it is to have that impact. MR. BROOKS: Okay. Members of the committee, do you have any questions?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. MITCHELL: I do, if I may. There are 17 trade unions. Would they all be signatories to a PLA if one was approved?

MR. SABITONI: As of today, 16 out of 17 would be signatory to this, and I would probably say that I would be able to get the 17th craft to sign on as well. That craft is an operating engineer who is not currently affiliated with the building trades.

MR. BROOKS: And, Mr. Sabitoni, have the operating engineers signed separately on past PLAs that you have been familiar with, the URI chemistry building and others?

MR. SABITONI: In the history that has happened from time to time. In the last three projects it has not. But I will also offer that the fact that you have 16 crafts on board out of 17 is a great insurance policy for the owner. Not having one is not a deterrent. Having one is a deterrent, even if you had 1 craft, 1 out of 16 that would not participate in the Project Labor Agreement.

That's been my prior testimony as well on the other projects that have Project Labor

Agreements in place and the operating engineer is there, is participating, and it's my belief that he will continue all the way to completion.

MR. SABITONI: The carpenters are back, reaffiliated with the building trades, and will be part of this Project Labor Agreement.

MR. O'BRIEN: So the carpenters have signed?

MR. MITCHELL: If I may, if I'm not mistaken, there are employee unions here at Rhode Island College. In the event of a work stoppage or work action by a state employee union, would the PLA require your trades to continue to work?

MR. SABITONI: I am legally obligated to man this project, and on behalf of the building trades we will man it regardless of what entity decides to do what type of demonstration. And, again, that's the reason why the owner, because of a certainty, and the client, choses to enter into these agreements.

So unfortunately should my brothers

and sisters ask me or any other -- and, by the way, in my capacity as business manager of Rhode Island Labor Business Council, I represent 6,000 public employees across the state of Rhode Island. Should that occur, we will man and are obligated to man and continue to construct these projects and we will.

MR. O'BRIEN: Michael, if a non-union subcontractor is a successful bidder, to what extent could it use its own personnel?

MR. SABITONI: At that point, as contained in the project agreements that I've negotiated in the past, we have what we call a pre-job conference. The relative craft would sit down with that subcontractor and come up with a reasonable and practical resolution on how to proceed on the project.

In my history, usually when that happens it's usually a one-for-one so that let's say there's going to be ten brick layers needed on a project. A practical solution is that the union would afford five bricklayers along with five non-union bricklayers. And sometimes it could be more or sometimes it could be less but, usually, in my experience and history, we're usually able to come up with a real practical solution so that both

parties are happy.

MR. O'BRIEN: And would the non-union sub be required to pay into the union's pension without --

MR. SABITONI: Only for the employees that he is provided for by the union. That, again, is I believe contained in the letter that I submitted.

There's no double benefits for the key individuals.

As long as he's paying the prevailing rate in Rhode

Island or the equivalent and he's got that structure, that's his business. The only obligation to pay into our funds would be for the men that we refer to him from our halls. That's it.

MR. O'BRIEN: So the five and five, his five would be --

MR. SABITONI: His five are exempt. As long as he's paying prevailing rate, he can pay them all in the envelope, he can -- he's got a benefit structure that's equivalent to the prevailing rate, he's in compliance. He's in compliance with the Project Labor Agreement as well.

MR. O'BRIEN: Thank you.

MR. MITCHELL: If I may, are there any issues with paying prevailing wage or is the state trying to shift law requirements when there's a PLA

in place?

MR. SABITONI: No. As a matter of fact, you'll be in full compliance. I'll make sure of that, especially with apprenticeship.

I might even add -- that's a good question, Michael, that both on public and private PLAs that I negotiate on behalf of the building trades, that we try to insert our apprenticeship utilization as well so we can provide work opportunities for young people, men, and women that want to enter our industry. And we'll provide that as well, so there will be apprentices on this project.

And, in addition, with the CVS project, the ones that I'm negotiating now with Deepwater and the Procaccianti Group with the hotel downtown and additional private PLAs, we negotiated that into those private PLAs as well, just not when it's a public works project.

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you.

MR. BROOKS: One question, Michael. In terms of if the project has a goal set for minority participation, would a PLA adversely impact the project's ability to attract minority contractors?

MR. SABITONI: Absolutely not. Absolutely not. It's a public works project. And I know that we've had discussions in the past. The impact on the — if you're talking about the contracting aspect of the minority business participation, it just has to do with size and scope and the ability to bond and the complexity of the projects I think sometimes that limit or hinder the participation of minority business entities.

Whether there's a PLA or not would not. There is no hinderance whatsoever. As a matter of fact, I actually think it's a benefit for a company to have access, if it doesn't already, especially if it's smaller in statute to have access to the best trained workforce in the construction industry via the building trades, to be able to call and get a qualified, licensed, safety-conscientious workforce when you need it and when you're done, send them back to the hall. I look at it from the other view.

MR. BROOKS: Any other committee members?

MR. FITTA: Yes. You had mentioned that
there would be no adverse impacts on the owner with
regard to PLAs and that you have several public works

and PLA projects in process that are on time and on budget. I'm sure you're aware that there are studies out there that suggest that PLAs can increase costs.

Do you have anything that you can share with the committee to refute that or support the claim that there are no adverse impacts?

MR. SABITONI: As far as my colleague has stated, there has been no study that I am aware of that ever took place in the state of Rhode Island that shows that PLAs increase costs.

I am aware of two studies, the Beacon Hill Institute study in Massachusetts, the Fall River study. It's my belief that those studies were flawed due to the fact that in one of those studies there were different scopes of work when they looked at it and they had bids go in and go out. And the second one, the study was actually paid for and executed by a merit think tank to try and promote the nonuse of Project Labor Agreements.

And I guess, again, the best evidence I could give the committee is my comments I made a few minutes ago earlier. If these were so cost prohibitive and if they added to the bottom line and companies knew that, then why would for-profit large

Fortune 500 companies that have to answer to stakeholders who all have stocks, enter into it?

That's the best evidence I can give because the last time I checked, if I was a stockholder and they were paying extra money just because, without any reason, the reason is it's in their best interest, and if they had evidence to the contrary that it was cost prohibitive, private industry wouldn't do it. And the evidence is to the contrary. Private industry, it's in their best interest. That's why they do it.

MR. BROOKS: Any other questions?

MR. MITCHELL: If I may, something that I meant to ask earlier, do your member unions have recruitment and training programs for veterans?

MR. SABITONI: Absolutely. That's another good question, Michael. I appreciate it. Also contained in these Project Labor Agreements through our Building Futures Program is not only our minority outreach for bringing diversity into the building trades but in that program as well, our outreach to veterans that are able to enter our apprenticeship programs directly due to their service to their country.

1 And I'd be happy to share with you, 2 and I know you're probably aware of some of the PLAs 3 that we've already negotiated. It's right in there. 4 There's a program that we call Helmets to Hardhats 5 under our Building Futures umbrella. 6 So we really concentrate on trying to 7 bring not only diversity into our ranks but also 8 veterans into our ranks, and not only because they 9 deserve it because of the service they have done for our country, but selfishly, from the building trades 10 11 standpoint, we believe these men and women are a 12 perfect fit in our industry to transition into civilian life because of our structure. Those are 13 14 the men and women that we want, and we have that in 15 writing. 16 MR. MITCHELL: Thank you. 17 MR. BROOKS: Anyone else? Thank you. 18 MR. SABITONI: Thank you very much. 19 MR. BROOKS: The next speaker is Roy 20 Coulombe. 21 MR. COULOMBE: My name is Roy Coulombe, Vice 22 President of the Building Trades, and I'll be brief. 23 I think everything has been pretty much covered.

For over 40 years now members of the

24

building trades and bosses or superintendents of various subcontractors have worked on various college projects, including here at RIC. And college work is a little different than a lot of other construction sites because of the close proximity to the students and the interaction with the daily life of a college campus. You need the best. We think we're the best and I think you should do this Project Labor Agreement and I think it will work out. Any questions? Thank you very much.

MR. BROOKS: Scott Duhamel from Rhode Island Building Trades.

MR. DUHAMEL: Good afternoon. Scott

Duhamel, Secretary Treasurer of the Rhode Island

Building Trades and a Rhode Island College Alumni.

I will be brief also because of what Mr. Mancini and Mr. Sabatoni have said and is evidence in itself. And I thought of a telling anecdote. On this campus, twice or three times last year, Mr. Sabitoni and I ran into Madam President Carriulo outside the campus at various events, and she came running up to us and she said, can you help me out? And she was referring to the two prior projects done here by KBE and Iron Construction,

which were falling behind schedule, in various disarray, and there's no hiding this, not delivering on time.

Our answer was, we're sorry, we can't help you. This is not a PLA. It's a mixed bag.

Those contractors are in a vacuum to themselves, and I think it's an appropriate time that Rhode Island College gets a project delivered correctly, on time, coordinated properly the way it should be on a college campus, and I think it would be quite evident afterwards we will be celebrating the way this comes in when this job comes in safe, on time, and everything else we talked about. That's all I have. Any questions?

MR. BROOKS: Any questions? Thank you very much. Are there any other members of the public to come before this public hearing? Just if I could ask that the sign-in sheet be entered as Exhibit 5.

(Exhibit No. 5 was marked.)

MR. BROOKS: We should -- first of all, the committee will stand subject to a motion to recess after this public hearing is closed. Our next meeting will be on July 3, 2014 at 9:00 a.m. We will be posting a notice publicly where that will take

1	place. We're just not sure if it will be on the
2	campus of Rhode Island College. And besides that, I
3	think we could take a motion to stand adjourned and
4	to close this public hearing.
5	MR. MITCHELL: I'll move to adjourn and
6	close this public hearing with the understanding we
7	will reconvene on July 3rd.
8	MR. BROOKS: We have a motion. Do we have a
9	second?
10	MR. SIMSON: Second.
11	MR. BROOKS: All members of the committee in
12	favor?
13	(VOICE VOTE TAKEN)
14	(UNANIMOUS)
15	MR. BROOKS: All opposed? The meeting is
16	adjourned. Thank you.
17	(The public hearing was adjourned at 1:55 p.m.)
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

CERTIFICATE
I, Diane J. DeStefano, a Notary Public in and for the
State of Rhode Island, hereby certify that the
foregoing pages are a true and accurate record of my
stenographic notes that were reduced to print through
computer-aided transcription.
In witness whereof, I hereunto set my
hand this 22nd day of June, 2014.
Diane J. DeStefano, Notary Public